

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-7516

SHANE BRANDON DAVIDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM CATOE, Director, South Carolina Department of Corrections; CARL FREDRICK; CLIFFORD GLOVER, Major; JAMES P. HALL, Captain,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 00-7517

SHANE BRANDON DAVIDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY; BOYKIN ROSE, Director; TOM ROSSON, Construction Superintendent; BRUCE CLONTS, Supervisor,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (CA-00-939-6-13AK, CA-00-947-6-13AK)

Submitted: April 27, 2001

Decided: May 3, 2001

Before LUTTIG and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shane Brandon Davidson, Appellant Pro Se. William Michael Duncan, Raymon E. Lark, Jr., AUSTIN, LEWIS & ROGERS, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Shane Brandon Davidson appeals the district court's orders dismissing his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) complaints. Davidson's cases were referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Davidson that failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Davidson failed to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

The timely filing of objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned that failure to object will waive appellate review. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arm, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Davidson has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED